

cultural proposals made by one member of GATT against those made by another.

It would be regrettable if, in this way, agriculture were to regress on the international plane to the position of isolation from which it has just emerged on the national plane. The most profitable, most modern agricultural systems are found in those countries where they have the most frequent and the closest contact with industry.

If, within GATT, agricultural concessions could be balanced by industrial concessions, reciprocal obligations would arise between them. A modernization of agriculture would therefore have to go hand in hand with reduced protection of trade in farm products. For this, industrialization and integration of towns and the countryside are necessary, leading to a community of interests between agriculture and industry. It seems far-fetched; but, all the same, this could be one of the positive results of the Kennedy Round.

It is essential for the EEC and the USA to reach agreement in the agricultural sector. If they do not, they risk a relapse into agricultural isolationism, with countries trying to wrest concessions from each other by threats in the field of commercial policy. Something of the sort can already be seen in the attitude to the Kennedy Round adopted by COPA, the Committee of Agricultural Organizations in the Community. Pressure groups on both sides of the Atlantic would nullify the political concept which inspired President Kennedy when he made his offer of an Atlantic partnership between the USA and the countries of Western Europe working in co-operation.

Let us hope that the partnership concept wins out over the short-sightedness of the pressure groups.

If the Western world is more than just the sum of the "free" intertests of a number of groupings with great economic and political power, it must be shown in the Kennedy Round negotiations and in the following UNCTAD negotiations.

PRESIDENT'S SOCIAL SECURITY PACKAGE HOLDS SURPRISES

(Mr. SKUBITZ (at the request of Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1967, President Johnson came to the Congress of the United States with a message on older Americans and a request for social security legislation. That evening, the Evening Star carried the byline: "15 to 59 Percent Rise Asked in Social Security," and in the first paragraph of that story the President was quoted as "urging Congress to 'bring the greatest improvement in living standards for the elderly' since the Social Security Act was passed in 1935." And from coast to coast, news media carried stories of the President's proposal. A promised increase in benefits of 20 percent has been widely publicized.

Few people realize that the President has written a whole new set of tax provisions for the senior citizen—that he plans to drastically change what we have regarded as sound and just principles. First, he would repeal the extra \$600 exemption provision for persons reaching age 65 and replace it with one which is related to individual income. Second, he would make social security and railroad retirement pensions taxable income—they have been tax free since 1940. In fact, many persons would never

realize an increase in income from the President's proposal. Many "older Americans" would pay more taxes than ever before while all "younger Americans" would feel the pinch of higher social security taxes.

The only way to reap the President's reward would be to continue working after retirement age and to forget about pensions or retirement income—if that can be considered just reward. It is a principle which has no relationship to the philosophy underlying the social security program in its inception.

Let me further point out that the President's proposal assumes that the working force of our society who are contributing to social security are the persons who should bear the responsibility of providing for our senior citizens. The President's bill calls for these people to finance the cost of inflation by paying a higher payroll tax. Second, the President fails to recognize that our economy will continue to change in the next few years. There is no reason to believe that inflation will not continue—but the administration refuses to make social security benefits inflationproof by including a provision for automatic adjustments in benefits to correspond with the cost of living. Failing to include such a provision in the past lies at the heart of the problem facing us now. Finally, the President's proposal is politically motivated, carefully molded to fit around election years. Payroll tax hikes are disguised—one year he would raise the tax base; the next year he would raise the tax rate; but never would the more obvious raise in the tax rate precede an important election year.

Now we are all familiar with the President's love of "surprises and secrecy"—but I submit, this proposal should not be held out to the people like "good candy." It is "chocolate covered" but the "filling" will disappoint many senior citizens.

YOUNG MEN WITHOUT A COUNTRY

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with much discussion on the possible revision of the draft in evidence these days, one facet of this issue needs closer inspection. This is the practice of running to Canada to seek a sanctuary from U.S. military service which approximately 3,000 American citizens have resorted to in the recent past. It is hoped that when final draft revisions are presented, corrective measures will be proposed to rectify this practice. With thousands of American boys setting a fine example in Vietnam, it is distressing that these so-called Americans can flout the law.

I include the article, "Young Men With a Country—In Canada To Avoid the Draft," from the New York Daily News of February 19, 1967, by George Nobbe, in the RECORD at this point:

YOUNG MEN WITHOUT A COUNTRY—IN CANADA
TO AVOID THE DRAFT
(By George Nobbe)

TORONTO, February 18.—While 150,000 American draftee fight and die in the steam-

ing jungles of Vietnam, other thousands of their young countrymen are finding a comfortable, bulletproof sanctuary in a land largely hostile to U.S. policy in Asia.

These are the new breed of draft dodgers, mostly self-proclaimed pacifists, who are quietly drifting across the Canadian border in ever-growing numbers to settle in peaceful if self-conscious anonymity in Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver.

Estimates now put their total at up to 3,000, most of them in their early 20s and all of them quite safe from the law—our extradition treaty with Canada does not let federal agents retrieve Americans who go north to duck military service.

In Canada, some teach or study, others paint, write or hold a variety of odd jobs in a country that has not had conscription since the end of World War II.

But all of them have one thing in common in addition to their aversion to khaki: they can't come home again. This will remain so even if peace comes to Vietnam and even if the U.S. should suddenly abolish the draft, for there is no statute of limitations on draft dodgers who leave the country.

An expatriate band who are still only a source of minor irritation to Washington and occasional embarrassment to their hosts, they face five years in jail and \$10,000 fines if they are caught on the American side of the border.

Canada's almost childishly simple immigration and citizenship requirements are luring more and more of them north as the months go by. A huge influx is expected in June, when graduating college seniors run out of 2-S student deferments in this country.

Their cause has been taken up by the emerging New Left among Canadian youth; organizations such as the Montreal Council to Aid War Resisters, The Toronto Student Union for Peace Action and the Vancouver Committee to Aid War Objectors have sprung up across Canada.

Another, the Union Generale des Etudiants de Quebec, along with a loosely-knit collection of pacifists at the University of Waterloo, is even exploring the possibility of providing living quarters, food and small amounts of money for incoming Americans.

The financing of these groups is something of a mystery. Their leaders maintain that voluntary contributions, membership dues and some cash from the sale of propaganda literature cover most of the operating costs.

The Canadian government has adopted a hands-off policy on the draft dodgers, largely because they aren't actually breaking any law. It offers neither aid nor encouragement to them.

But if the administration of Prime Minister Lester Pearson, occasionally harassed by a parliamentary minority on the issue, doesn't actively encourage these refugees from the draft, it doesn't exactly make things difficult for them, either. And it resents alleged U.S. efforts to hustle them back across the border.

The FBI has been blamed repeatedly for hounding draft-dodging Americans as well as Canadians who work briefly in the States and then duck back across the line when draft calls show up. Washington heatedly denies these charges.

NEEDLES LAW

One American, 22-year-old Tom Hathaway, who ducked out of Boston when his induction notice came in 1963 and went to Toronto to study at the Royal Conservatory of Music, grew so tired of periodic searches of his apartment that he tacked this notice to his door:

"FBI, CIA or RCMP: Please don't rifle through my wife's drawers. Thank you."

Hathaway, for whom a warrant has been issued, explains his reluctance to serve by saying, "I don't like the idea of compulsory service. It's like some guy coming up to me